

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 93 04:30:07 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1212
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 12 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 1212

Today's Topics:

Astatic D104
FT-530 mod
Homoseckshul hams
I LOVE CW!!!!
Imminent Death of Ham Radio: 2m HT in Penney's Christmas Catalog
Intolerance and stuff
Motorola ad in QST? (2 msgs)
re:Motorola

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 15:26:21 -0600
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
spool.mu.edu!umn.edu!kksys.com!edgar!tdkt!FredGate@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Astatic D104
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello,

I have a Kenwood 830s with an old Shure mic and I would like to get an
Astatic chrome mic. I know where I can get one but, I am wondering a
couple of things before I buy it:

- 1) Will it work with the Kenwood 830s? (it is the correct impedance?)
- 2) Where can I find a replace mic element for the Astatic that has great
audio quality?

Any help is appreciated.

Eric Koester, KA0YWN

* Origin: HAM>link< RBBS 612/HAM-0000 Saint Paul, MN [K0TG] (1:282/100)

Date: 11 Oct 93 23:29:46
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!avdms8.msfc.nasa.gov!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.cs.columbia.edu!popovich@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FT-530 mod
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> YAESU FT-530
>
> Expanded Receive 110-180, 300-500 MHz
> Expanded Transmit 130-180, 400-470 MHz
>
> NOT LEGAL IN U.S.A - FOR EXPORT ONLY

In what way is this mod "not legal"? The expanded receive doesn't cover the cellular band, so the ECPA doesn't come into it, and I don't know of any other restrictions on ownership or modification (as opposed to use of possibly modified equipment) of radio receivers and/or transmitters (well, besides the 11 meter amplifier ban, which also doesn't apply). So what law is this mod against, or is this disclaimer just a "CYA" measure?

-Steve, WB3I

Date: 11 Oct 93 20:18:12 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Homoseckshul hams
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) proclaims:

>But no one is nauseated by the activities of Jewish amateurs, VFW
>amateurs, NRA amateurs, Viet Nam Vet amateurs, ...

I don't think this is true. I happen to be nauseated by the activities of many NRA members, and there are plenty of people who are nauseated by the activities of Jews. If you mean their

ham activities are not nauseating to you, then why are Lambda members' *ham activities* nauseating to you? Do they get up to unspeakable things on Field Day, or somehow disgust you by the way they call CQ?

>If you want to attach a label to me, homophobic is not correct, for
>I do not fear homosexuals; homonauseated or homodisgusted would be
>much more accurate.

If you want to attach a label to me, it would be "amazed".

Derek "good heavens" Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 11 Oct 93 23:44:26
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.columbia.edu!news.cs.columbia.edu!popovich@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: I LOVE CW!!!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> I don't actually use ham radios for VHF/UHF. Instead, I prefer the quality
> and reliability of a Motorola. It saves me from having to do frequent
> checks on the local repeaters to be sure my radio is still working. I can
> just pick up the microphone with the distinctive blue "M" and communicate.

Oops, look out...you'll probably be served with the court papers tomorrow. :-)
Imagine, using a MOTOROLA! And it's probably MODIFIED, too!
Isn't that a crime? Or at least, their ad says so...;-)
-Steve, WB3I

Date: 11 Oct 93 12:21:41 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Imminent Death of Ham Radio: 2m HT in Penney's Christmas Catalog
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Oct10.144026.4994@mulvey.com> rich@mulvey.com writes:
:Cliff Sharp (clifto@indep1.UUCP) wrote:
:: SO many CBers bought them that two meters here became a wreck. In fact,
:: it appears to be the cause of a "nonstandard" operating mode in the
:: Chicago area; if one wants to break into a conversation, the convention
:: is not to say "break", it's to sign with your call. This was to make

:: sure the breaker HAD a call.
:
: Nonstandard operating mode? I wouldn't say that - I've encountered
:quite a few areas around the country (including my home, Rochester, NY)
:where this is a conventional way of getting into a conversation.

That's a problem unless one understands the rationale behind it. I was in Palm Springs back a while, trying to break into a conversation because I had some information they were missing, and kept signing with my call instead of just saying "break". They either were snobs (probably not) or I was out of place by signing my call to break in (more likely).

What I meant is that it's no longer the same all over the country. There are "islands" where a "break" may get one ignored, just because of the regional situation (in our case, Sears selling rigs that looked just like CBs, down to the 23-channel switch, to anyone who walked in the store or read the catalog). There are also places where signing one's call gets the breaker ignored. So go figure...

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|   WA9PDM     |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

Date: 11 Oct 1993 22:57:29 -0500

From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Intolerance and stuff

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

garys@Ingres.COM (Gary Swiger) says:

>I think it's a sad day for Amateur Radio when any special interest group tries
>to use Amateur Radio as a platform to promote their ideals - this is not the
>purpose of Amateur Radio...

Does anyone know what the ad said? If QST runs an ad for the QCWA, does that mean that we are all being forced to grow old suddenly? And looky here, on page 95 of the latest QST, someone wants to get in touch with anyone who served with the 1716th Signal Service Aviation Battalion in Manila in 1945-46. What is this guy doing - trying to promote the ideals of the military? And anyway, what does he mean, "get in touch with"? Nudge, nudge, say no more!! (actually, it says "would like to in touch with", that may even worse, I dunno).

That said, I have to add that the thought of a Lambda group trying

to hold a net on 75 meters sends shudders down my spine - them good old boys that own the band would have themselves a ball, hoo-eeey.

Yes, amateur radio is bringing the country to a new low, what with all them heteroseckshles in the schools - and I saw a lady's ankle the other day. Pass the smelling salts! (so to say).

Derek "how 'bout dem stains, then!" Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 11 Oct 1993 23:22:16 -0400
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!news.delphi.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Motorola ad in QST?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The relationship of Motorla and Hams hs not always been friendly, at least in my experiene. In most cases, old gear which could be used by hams for fun was destroyed rather than donated or sold cheap - perhaps out of fear that it would be resold back into the commercial service.

In addition there have been some anti-ham activities at some local shops and dealers, such as blaming amateur installations for any and all sorts of site problems.

On the other hand, I've known some wonderful folks who work for the big M, and they make the other stress bearabl.

Steve Johnston WD8DAS SteveBJ@delphi.com

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 1993 04:54:03 GMT
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Motorola ad in QST?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

burke_br@adcae1.comm.mot.com (Bruce Burke Sp App) writes:

>Because you have given the customer something he hasn't paid for and
>you are making a living from it.

I buy a copy of a book. I then resell the book for more than I paid for it. Crime? Nope.

I buy a Motorola radio. I make firmware modifications to it. Crime?
Nope.

>Yes copyright laws do apply when it comes to altering computer code and
>then trying to make a living from it.

The only thing that copyright law protects with regard to computer code is my ability to sell copies of it. If I own a legally-purchased copy of computer code, I am more than within my rights, as determined by the courts, to make modifications myself (or hire someone to make modifications for me) to my copy of that computer code. I am also entirely within my rights to publish *MY* modifications, which are *MY* property (as defined by that oh-so-sacred Copyright which you constantly refer to...) as I see fit. The fact that these modifications happen to "turn on" certain functions or abilities within Motorola radios... Well, its just not my problem...

If I purchase a copy of Star Trek, and decide to modify the program to make the Klingons fight harder, I am within my right to do so. I can then publish my modifications so all owners of Star Trek can also make the mod, if they want to.

What copyright law prevents me from doing is taking my copy of Star Trek, making a modification, and then reselling multiple copies of my modified version.

>And while we are at it -
>every time you sing Happy Birthday, technically you owe someone a royalty
>because that song is copyrighted!

Technically... NOT!

A copyright which isn't enforced is lost, hath saideth the courts.

>As for books, go ahead and pull a chapter out of
>one and try to republish it with your name on it and watch what happens!

See above.

>Messing with the computer code for profit is another.

Gee, I wonder my Microsoft hasn't persecuted all those people who came up with MS-DOS patches to "enhance" the operating system...

>You are the one who needs to study, you obviously don't understand what the
>issue is.

Oh, but Bruce, I **DO** understand what the issue is. And I understand that
it is complete, utter, bullshit.

I've been acutely aware of what is and what isn't legal, after spending
several months working on copyright and patent filing preparations
with several intellectual-property attorneys in Arlington, VA, for a
device I assisted in the engineering and firmware development of.
Can you say the same, Bruce?

>There are all kinds of protected items within a radio.
>Proprietary IC's are one.

Which are, if I'm not mistaken, generally protected via patent, are they
not? Very different from a copyright.

>So is the computer code which makes the radio what it is. When you buy a radio
>that is driven by a microprocessor and computer code, you are not buying the
>code and that is where many people think they know better. You are merely being
>licensed to use it.

Please provide the readers evidence of this license agreement. Furthermore,
please show where within the license agreement that it stipulates that
only Motorola may make modifications to said radios.

Are said license agreements signed by the parties prior to purchase, or
are they simply "mentioned" in an owners' manual or some other such
documentation?

Computer firmware is protected by copyright (although specific
algorithms implemented by said code may be protected by patent).
Copyright law does not prevent owner modification.

>The company still retains ownership of it. Just like
>going out and buying sheet music or a book.

Sure, and the company can make other copies of it. But, just as I can
write in the book I purchase down the street, I can also make modifications
to your firmware. I simply can't take a copy of yours and start selling
it. And, Bit 3 of Location 0x123 isn't a copyrightable item.

>As for what side I stand on, that is my business. If you
>don't like it, fine, but you can't tell me where to stand on an issue.

I don't blame you for spouting the party propaganda, Bruce. It would simply be better if you actually knew something about what you were attempting to spout. Simply repeating what you've been spoon-fed doesn't automatically make it become truth. Instead, try taking an actual class on copyright law, or perhaps post a few messages in misc.int-property to learn something.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ -
-- Internet: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com - Providence Firefighters Association:
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz - We Find 'Em Hot, And Leave 'Em Wet
-- AT&TNet: 401-273-4669 -

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 1993 03:57:28 GMT
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.uiowa.edu!herky.cs.uiowa.edu!mau@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: re:Motorola
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
Path: news.uiowa.edu!hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!
uunet!spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius
From: Jim Jaskie <jim_jaskie@tempeqm.sps.mot.com>
Subject: Re: re: MOTOROLA
Message-ID: <1993oct11.204101.27221@newsgate.sps.mot.com>
Sender: news@newsgate.sps.mot.com
Nntp-Posting-Host: 221.5.10.84
Organization: Motorola Phoenix Corp. Research Laboratory
X-Useragent: Nuntius v1.1
References: <1993oct9.041319.25429@news.uiowa.edu>
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 20:41:01 GMT
Lines: 29

In article <1993oct9.041319.25429@news.uiowa.edu> Napoleon Mau,
mau@herky.cs.uiowa.edu writes:
>Motorola did not pay millions of dollars to write the software. They
went to
>the local Radio shack and they bought a DPS and a D/A chips. then they
>took the chips and put them in the radio. Then they bought a book from the
>local bookstore about signal processing algorithms, and they implemented
>these algorithms.

>
>They hired 2 engineers, probably EE grad students, and they pay them
>\$4.65/hour to write the code. It took these 2 people a few months to do
>the work.

Let's see, you must be at a school. Ah, University of Iowa. That explains it.

>How many commercial products have you developed with a "DPS" (Department
>of Public Service chip?) and a book from a local bookstore.
Correction: DPS = Department of Public Safety.
> If you or
>your friends with actual, real, degrees from recognized schools (and you
>actually know more about engineering than this post let's on) are only
>paid \$4.65/hour, let me know. I've got a bunch of work for you.

Your answer reminds me of an article I read in Byte magazine years back about the first days of microprocessors. When the 6500 (??) CPU was announced, it was announced that its price would be \$5 per CPU. At that time Motorola and other CPU makers were selling their CPUs for about \$125 a piece. The Motorola dealer asked by the journalist who wrote the article said that it would be impossible to sell a CPU for \$5. The day of the presentation of the new CPU to the public came and as announced the price of the CPU was \$5 and you had to pay another \$5 for the manual. It took a few days for Motorola to find a way to lower its manufacturing costs and sell their CPUs for equivalent prices.

A few years back a friend of mine bought a math coprocessor for his computer. He paid about \$600 for an Intel 387. The list price of a 387 was \$900. A month later the list price went to \$300. And today the price is \$99 ???. I wonder how can Intel pay all these hundreds of engineers who worked for years to develop that chip.

I would admit that I have not developed and commercial products with Department of Public Safety chips. But I have developed enough software using DPS boards to know that the price you pay for many of these commercial products is unreal. You pay a huge price not because the hardware is unique, but because the software that comes with it is what you need.

>Thank you for welcoming me to the real world. Fortunately (or
>unfortunately depending on how you look at) I've been in the real world
>(tm) for awhile now. Let me know when they let you have a real peek.

In article <jfhCEr30t.8Fo@netcom.com> jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:
>garys@Ingres.COM (Gary Swiger) wrote:

>
>>I think it's a sad day for Amateur Radio when any special interest group tries
>>to use Amateur Radio as a platform to promote their ideals - this is not the
>>purpose of Amateur Radio...

>
>All Lamda wanted to do was to take out an ad. Do you object to QST running
>ads by the Jewish amateur radio group?

>
>--

>
>-----
>Jack Hamilton POB 281107 SF CA 94128 USA
>jfh@netcom.com kd6ttl@w6pw.#nocal.ca.us.na

But no one is nauseated by the activities of Jewish amateurs, VFW
amateurs, NRA amateurs, Viet Nam Vet amateurs, ...

If you want to attach a label to me, homophobic is not correct, for
I do not fear homosexuals; homonaused or homodisgusted would be
much more accurate.

Jeff NH6IL (back when this country had higher morals: WA6QIJ)

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 1993 00:31:45 GMT
From: psinntp!isc-newsserver!ultb!jdc3538@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <29a3dv\$mqq1@newsserv.cs.sunysb.edu>, <RR49ac2w165w@sytex.com>,
<29bt0r\$1aq@newsserv.cs.sunysb.edu>
Subject : Re: Turning in RFI generating PC's to FCC

In article <29bt0r\$1aq@newsserv.cs.sunysb.edu> rick@cs.sunysb.edu (Rick Spanbauer)
writes:

>: rick@cs.sunysb.edu (Rick Spanbauer) writes:

>
> Bob, lets say I walk into a reseller and purchase a properly
> certified DX-33 along with a DX-66 cpu chip. I ask the reseller
> to install the DX-66 chip and she does. I take the system home
> and find it radiates wideband interference all over 20m cw band.
> In the case, I think you would agree that the original mfg
> is probably not to blame for the EMI problem. Just this sort
> of thing happens all the time at the reseller level. If the
> (etc.)

> Rick Spanbauer, WB2CFV

> State University of New York
>

Sorry, Rick, but this was not the case (no pun intended) here. The company in question assembles complete systems out of motherboards, cabinets, I/O cards, etc. that other companies produce.

It was their choice to sell unshielded cabinets.

It was their choice to place FCC-part-15 sticker on a device that certainly violates those regulations.

It was their choice to install unlicensed copies of DOS/Windows on it. (Nothing to do with RFI, but a good example of their general attitude.)

People who hoist the Jolly Roger in the name of Corporate Profit deserve an occasional "whomp" upside the head.

73...Jim
N2VNO

Date: 12 Oct 93 05:55:53 GMT
From: ddsw1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <294fro\$k0a@funhouse.solbourne.com>, <2533@indep1.UUCP>,
<1993Oct11.235325.21923@en.ecn.purdue.edu>dep1
Subject : Re: Imminent Death of Ham Radio: 2m HT in Penney's Christmas Catalog

In article <1993Oct11.235325.21923@en.ecn.purdue.edu> n9ljx@en.ecn.purdue.edu (Scott A Stambaugh) writes:

:In article <2533@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
:> Years and years ago, Sears carried both a synthesized and a crystal-
:>controlled 2M mobile radio. Looked JUST like a CB, down to having 23
:>"channels" on the frequency switch (the xtal-bound unit, that is). SO
:>many CBers bought them that two meters here became a wreck. In fact,
:>it appears to be the cause of a "nonstandard" operating mode in the
:>Chicago area; if one wants to break into a conversation, the convention
:>is not to say "break", it's to sign with your call. This was to make
:>sure the breaker HAD a call.
:> Expect much more of the same, and much worse, as these units hit the
:>market.

:
:Gee, my old Drake TR-72 is a 23 channel xtal controlled radio. I am not sure
:of the manufacture date, but I wonder if our dear friends at Drake were
:trying to sabotage the Ham bands?

You're missing the point here. It wasn't (and still isn't) possible to walk into the local Drake store, pull out your Drake credit card and take home a Drake 23-channel 2M rig.

There's a better-than-even chance that half the non-hams who bought them never realized they weren't buying a CB until they put the thing on the air.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|    WA9PDM    |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1212
